

REMARKS

The present Response supplements the Amendment filed August 16, 2010 and clarifies certain remarks presented in the Amendment.

Particularly, the remarks of the Amendment stated that by carefully controlling the reactants and reaction conditions, the present process allows the production in a single reactor of a desirable and versatile PAS from relatively inexpensive reactants, providing an economically viable process (see, for example, page 7, lines 1-3). It should be noted that “production in a single reactor” refers to the fact that the dehydration step and the subsequent polymerization steps are conducted in the same reactor as recited in claim 5. One of ordinary skill in the art will appreciate that other features of the claimed process may be conducted in the same reactor or other reactor(s).

Similarly, while the *Azo Materials* and *Business Wire* articles submitted with the Amendment and discussed at page 8 of the Amendment describe the Fortron Industries LLC PPS plant as using a “one unit” process, the process of claim 5 only requires that the dehydration step and the subsequent polymerization steps are conducted in the same reactor and, as noted above, other features of the claimed process may be conducted in the same reactor or other reactor(s), so that the process of claim 5 is not necessarily a “one unit” process as described in the *Azo Materials* and *Business Wire* articles. Nonetheless, these articles demonstrate that efficient processes for producing PPS are technically important and it will therefore be recognized that the ability to produce a PAS such as PPS from the relatively less expensive alkali metal hydrosulfide and alkali metal hydroxide as starting reactants as claimed, while providing a product having a good combination of properties in a stable manner, is a significant and unexpected advance in the art.

Finally, while the Examiner has asserted that the PAS product would have been inherent in the assertedly obvious, modified process of Miyahara et al, it is important to note that the view that the success of the present process would have been inherent in the modified process cannot substitute for a reasonable expectation of success; inherency and obviousness are entirely different concepts, *In re Rinehart*, 531 F.2d 1048 (C.C.P.A. 1976). The teachings of Miyahara et al do not provide one of ordinary skill in the art with a reasonable expectation of the success provided by the presently claimed method.

For the reasons set forth in detail in the Amendment, viewed in light of the additional remarks herein, it is believed that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 has been overcome and the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and an early allowance are requested.

Please charge any fees required in connection with the present communication, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 503915.

Respectfully submitted,

/Holly D. Kozlowski/

Holly D. Kozlowski, Reg. No. 30,468
Porter, Wright, Morris & Arthur LLP
250 East Fifth Street, Suite 2200
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
(513) 369-4224